

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 09/683,338	Applicant(s) YAGER ET AL.	
	Examiner Kambiz Zand	Art Unit 2132	

All Participants:

(1) Kambiz Zand.

(2) David F. Yager.

Date of Interview: 27 April 2005

Type of Interview:
☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)
Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No
 If Yes, provide a brief description: _____

Part I.
 Rejection(s) discussed:
 102

 Claims discussed:
 1-20

 Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.
 SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:
See Continuation Sheet


Part III.
☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

Status of Application: response to Non-Final

(3) _____

(4) _____

Time: 2:45 PM



 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner and Applicant agreed on the following points in order for the claims to be allowable over prior art:

- 1- All modification of the claims are done by Examiner amendment.
- 2- Independent claims 1 and 15 are amended to incorporate the critical feature of the invention "the the database and said access control device are not electrically connected and have security code activities that are synchronized, wherein the database and said access control device operate independently" into the claims language.
- 3- Independent claim 1 further is amended to incorporate limitations set forth in dependent claim 12.
- 4- Claims 18-20 has been re-numbered as claims 18-19 by mistake. Examiner would amend claims in order to correct the numbering of the claims.
- 5- Claim 12 would be cancelled by Examiner amendment since the limitations are incorporated into independent claim 1.
- 6- Applicant agreed further, that Examiner amendment to the claims 1-20 are permissible in order to correct any typographical errors, 101 and 112 issues, grammatical errors and defective claims language format.